



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,625	01/11/2001	Ralph H. Echols	2000-IP-001727	8980
20558	7590	03/02/2004	EXAMINER	
KONNEKER & SMITH P. C. 660 NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY SUITE 230 PLANO, TX 75074			CECIL, TERRY K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1723		

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/758,625	ECHOLS ET AL. <i>OK</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mr. Terry K. Cecil	1723

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 5-6, 8, 10, 15 and 84-85 and 87-97.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: attached comments

Terry K. Cecil
 Mr. Terry K. Cecil
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 1723

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's new limitation requiring that the flow passages be formed laterally through the sidewall requires further consideration. However, it could be argued that such lateral flow passages are shown in Gano.

Attachment to the Advisory Action

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2-12-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

- Applicant's main argument is that the applied references do not show an perforated innermost tubular member wherein the member has imbedded lines because there is no motivation to combine the references, i.e. Curlett with Gano. However, the examiner contends that Curlett's teaching of an innermost tubular member having the benefit of running multiple lines in embedded conduit lines is sufficient motivation for combining the references since such would provide protection to the lines—which is desired by Curlett. It is also contended that since the apparatus of Curlett can also be used in a production stage, the obviousness rejection is further affirmed.
- Applicant also argues that Curlett does not teach the claimed well screen, since his screen member is at an end of his tubular member. However, it is pointed out that Gano has been relied upon for the innermost tubular member being perforated. It is further pointed out that Curlett's figure 19 depicts an innermost tubular member 286 having conduits 310 embedded therein that also includes apertures 314, which are considered to be perforations that would inherently perform a filtering function.
- It is also pointed out that since applicant has not required that the lines extend coaxially in a wall of the tubular to a point at the surface beyond an end of the tubular member, any line extending laterally through the member wall meets the claimed "embedded line". Notice, for example in figure 19, each of the sensors 20, 18, 290 can be considered "lines" that are

embedded in the wall member. It is also pointed out that without the aforementioned coaxial arrangement, any control line passing laterally through the sidewall of the tubular member to connect to a sensor within the central flow passage (e.g. 72 of Gano) would necessarily have an embedded line.

- In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references to reject claim 6, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).
- In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).
- In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See the first bullet above.

2. Contact Information:

- Examiner Mr. Terry K. Cecil can be reached at (571) 272-1138 at the Carlisle campus in Alexandria, Virginia for any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner. Note that the examiner is on the increased flextime schedule but can normally be found in the office during the hours of 8:30a to 4:30p, on at least four days during the week M-F.
- Wanda Walker, the examiner's supervisor, can be reached at (571) 272-1151 if attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful.
- The Fax number for this art unit for official faxes is 703-872-9306.
- Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mr. Terry K. Cecil
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

TKC
February 22, 2004